

regarding the appropriate action for Representative Obey's violations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of privilege.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 193, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—219

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Miller, George
Ackerman	Giffords	Mitchell
Allen	Gillibrand	Mollohan
Altmire	Gonzalez	Moore (KS)
Andrews	Gordon	Moore (WI)
Arcuri	Green, Al	Moran (VA)
Baca	Green, Gene	Murphy (CT)
Baird	Grijalva	Murphy, Patrick
Baldwin	Hall (NY)	Murtha
Barrow	Hare	Nadler
Bean	Harman	Napolitano
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Neal (MA)
Berkley	Herseth Sandlin	Obey
Berman	Higgins	Olver
Berry	Hill	Ortiz
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Pallone
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Pascarella
Blumenauer	Hodes	Pastor
Boren	Holden	Payne
Boswell	Holt	Perlmutter
Boyd (FL)	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Boyd (KS)	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Brady (PA)	Inslee	Price (NC)
Braley (IA)	Israel	Rahall
Brown, Corrine	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Butterfield	Jackson-Lee	Richardson
Capps	(TX)	Rodriguez
Capuano	Jefferson	Ross
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Carney	Jones (OH)	Ryan (OH)
Castor	Kagen	Salazar
Chandler	Kanjorski	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke	Kaptur	T.
Clay	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kilpatrick	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kind	Schiff
Cooper	Klein (FL)	Schwartz
Costa	Kucinich	Scott (GA)
Costello	Lampson	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Langevin	Serrano
Cramer	Larsen (WA)	Sestak
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Lee	Sherman
Cummings	Levin	Shuler
Davis (AL)	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Skelton
Davis (IL)	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Davis, Lincoln	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lowey	Snyder
DeGette	Lynch	Solis
DeLaunt	Mahoney (FL)	Space
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Dicks	Markey	Stupak
Dingell	Marshall	Sutton
Doggett	Matheson	Tanner
Donnelly	Matsui	Tauscher
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Taylor
Edwards	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	McDermott	Tierney
Ellsworth	McGovern	Towns
Emanuel	McIntyre	Tsongas
Engel	McNerney	Udall (CO)
Eshoo	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Fattah	Melancon	Visclosky
Filner	Michaud	Walz (MN)
Foster	Miller (NC)	

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt

Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)

NAYS—193

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer
Akin	Gallegly	Nunes
Alexander	Garrett (NJ)	Paul
Bachmann	Gerlach	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Gilchrest	Pence
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Peterson (PA)
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Petri
Biggart	Goode	Pickering
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Pitts
Bilirakis	Granger	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Poe
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Porter
Blunt	Hayes	Price (GA)
Boehner	Heller	Pryce (OH)
Bonner	Hensarling	Putnam
Bono Mack	Herger	Radanovich
Boozman	Hobson	Ramstad
Boustany	Hoekstra	Regula
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Rehberg
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Reichert
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Keller	Roskam
Calvert	King (IA)	Royce
Camp (MI)	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Kingston	Sali
Cannon	Kirk	Saxton
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Capito	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Carter	Kuhl (NY)	Sessions
Castle	LaHood	Shadegg
Chabot	Lamborn	Shays
Coble	Latham	Shimkus
Cole (OK)	LaTourette	Shuster
Conaway	Latta	Simpson
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Linder	Smith (TX)
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Souder
Davis, David	Lucas	Stearns
Davis, Tom	E.	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	Mack	Terry
Dent	Manzullo	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Doolittle	McCauley (TX)	Turner
Drake	McCotter	Upton
Dreier	McCrery	Walberg
Duncan	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Ehlers	McHugh	Walsh (NY)
Emerson	McKeon	Wamp
English (PA)	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Everett	Rodgers	Weller
Fallin	Mica	Westmoreland
Feeney	Miller (FL)	Whitfield (KY)
Ferguson	Miller (MI)	Wilson (NM)
Flake	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Moran (KS)	Wittman (VA)
Fortenberry	Murphy, Tim	Wolf
Fossella	Musgrave	Young (FL)
Fox	Myrick	
Franks (AZ)		

NOT VOTING—17

Bachus	Hooley	Spratt
Boucher	Oberstar	Tancred
Clyburn	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
Gutierrez	Renzi	Woolsey
Hall (TX)	Rothman	Young (AK)
Hinche	Rush	

□ 1342

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Messrs. PAYNE, MARKEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Messrs. CLEAVER, MELANCON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Messrs. HOLT, LYNCH, SKELTON and MCNERNEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 312, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1036 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1036

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Maloney of New York and Representative Saxton of New Jersey or their designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. After a motion that the Committee rise has been rejected on a legislative day, the Chair may entertain another such motion on that day only if offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget or the Majority Leader or a designee. After a motion to strike out the resolving words of the concurrent resolution (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII) has been rejected, the Chair may not entertain another such motion during further consideration of the concurrent resolution.

SEC. 3. During consideration in the House of House Concurrent Resolution 312 pursuant

to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the concurrent resolution to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 4. After adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 312, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 70 and to consider the Senate concurrent resolution in the House. All points of order against the Senate concurrent resolution and against its consideration are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the resolving clause of the Senate concurrent resolution and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 312 as adopted by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1036.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1036 provides for consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 312, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2009, under a structured rule.

The rule provides a total of 4 hours of general debate, 3 hours to be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies to be controlled by Representative MALONEY of New York and Representative SAXTON of New Jersey.

The rule makes in order the three substitute amendments: one by Representative KILPATRICK of Michigan; one by Representative LEE of California; and a final substitute by Representative RYAN of Wisconsin. Each amendment is debatable for 60 minutes. The rule also permits the chairman of the Budget Committee to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency. Finally, the rule provides that the concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, this is the traditional rule for consideration of the budget resolution, and I welcome today's debate on the alternative budgets that will be presented by the Republican leadership, the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by expressing my thanks and appreciation to Budget Committee Chairman SPRATT and Ranking Member RYAN for their leadership and hard work on the House Budget Committee. Although they hold very different points of view, the committee always operates in a cordial and collegial manner. I have served on the Budget Committee for 2 years, and it has been a privilege to learn from two such distinguished Members how to work in a bipartisan way despite sharp philosophical differences. And all of us are supported, Mr. Speaker, by a superb and dedicated committee staff.

Mr. Speaker, budgets are moral documents. They reflect our priorities. And for too long, this Congress passed budgets with the wrong priorities. For too long, our budgets put the desires of the powerful before the needs of the poor. For too long, our budgets pretended that people who were struggling didn't even exist, let alone matter. That has begun to change. The Democratic budget before us today is a budget with a conscience.

Today, we continue the new direction set last year to bring the Federal budget back to fiscal health and responsibility. As we begin this debate, our country faces major challenges: a looming recession, a crisis in the credit markets, a plunging housing market, rising unemployment, declining family income, skyrocketing costs in health care, aging infrastructure, and a safety net struggling to keep up with the growing number of Americans unable to meet their basic needs.

Faced with these challenges, President Bush proposed the same tired, worn-out, failed fiscal and economic policies. After 7 years, the Bush legacy is the highest deficits in our Nation's history. Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, when President Bush took office, when the Republicans had total control over the White House, the Senate and this House, they were welcomed with a \$5.6 trillion projected 10-year budget surplus, the financial gift of the last Democrat to sit in the White House. That has been completely squandered, resulting in the largest fiscal deterioration in American history. And the President's FY 2009 budget proposed only more of the same.

The national debt exploded under President Bush and his Republican rubber-stamp Congress. At the end of 2008, CBO projects a \$9.6 trillion debt, an increase of nearly \$4 trillion, brought to you courtesy of George Bush. Future generations, our children and our grandchildren, will be forced to pay the price for this unprecedented rise in debt thanks to the Republicans' fiscally reckless and irresponsible policies.

And to top it off, the President's budget continues the Bush legacy of deep cuts in many of the most important programs and services for the American people:

\$500 billion in cuts to Medicare.

\$100 billion in cuts to Medicaid, which serves the poorest Americans, including families with children.

The elimination of the Community Services Block Grant and the Social Services Block Grant, and deep cuts in the Community Development Block Grant, which provides nearly every city and town in America with Federal support for basic services.

Elimination of the Community Oriented Policing grants, the COPS grants, and deep cuts for State and local law enforcement at a time when States and local communities are finding it hard to meet the needs of their first responders.

And deep cuts in many other vital programs that provide health care, infrastructure, environmental protection, and other services to our States and to our neighborhoods.

Let me give but one example, Mr. Speaker, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, or LIHEAP. Last week, the worst snow storm in a century hit the people of Ohio and the Midwest. Two weeks ago, the people of central Massachusetts were facing over three feet of snow. Across the country, people are suffering in the cold. Home heating costs have gone up by 80 percent under George Bush. A barrel of oil now costs \$108. But President Bush decided to cut \$570 million out of the LIHEAP program. The President decided to turn off the heat for 1.2 million households, forcing families to choose either to heat or to eat. And why? So we could continue tax cuts for the wealthiest, most fortunate billionaires in America.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic budget rejects the President's priorities. It rejects the callous view of the Republican Party that tens of millions of American families are expendable, that our communities can manage without basic services, that our roads, bridges and water systems should be allowed to crumble and fail, and that we can run up America's credit card without costs or consequences.

Instead, the Democratic budget restores fiscal responsibility to the Federal budget, returning it to balance in the year 2012. It rejects the President's harmful cuts to basic services, and invests in proven programs that boost economic growth, create jobs, and make America safer.

The Democratic budget helps families struggling to make ends meet in this economic downturn, and provides fiscally responsible tax relief to millions and millions of households.

Finally, the Democratic budget remembers those who serve at home and abroad. It provides strong and substantial funding for national defense, including quality of life for our troops and our families.

It provides more funding for homeland security programs, including first responders, than the President would. And finally, it takes care of our veterans and rejects President Bush's cynical new fees for veterans health care.

Instead, the Democratic budget increases health care funding for our veterans well above current services, enough to allow the VA to treat 5.8 million patients in 2009, including over 333,000 Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 312, the fiscal year 2009 budget resolution, is a budget all Americans who believe in fiscal responsibility and the common good can support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there are only two ways to balance a budget, whether it's your family budget or the Federal budget. You can either spend less, or you can increase the amount of money coming in. The majority, as reflected in their budget, have flat out rejected option one and have chosen higher spending, higher taxes, and an ever-growing Federal Government.

The Republicans have chosen what I believe is a more responsible approach by committing to spending less and letting workers, families and small businesses keep more of their hard-earned income to save, invest, and spend as they see fit.

While Republicans have faith in the ability of families and workers to decide how best to use their paychecks, the majority budget reflects their belief that the Federal Government can make better choices at spending money than individual Americans. And that's really a fundamental difference between Democrats and Republicans.

In order for the majority to fund their government spending, their budget raises taxes, Mr. Speaker, by two-thirds of a trillion dollars over the next 5 years. Let me repeat that, two-thirds of a trillion dollars.

Now, you can call this a tax increase or you can call it letting tax cuts expire, but the bottom line is that under the Democrats' budget every American will pay more of their paycheck to the Federal Government.

Although the majority will try to claim otherwise, the numbers in their own budget document show that taxes will increase nearly three times more under their budget than the largest enacted tax increase to date in history, making this the largest tax increase in American history.

While the majority claims that their budget will protect middle-class families, their budget numbers tell a different story. Under the massive tax increases in the majority's budget, the average taxpayer in the State of Florida, for example, will see their annual tax bill rise over \$3,000.

The majority's budget does not extend tax relief from the marriage tax penalty. This means approximately 48 million married couples will face an average tax increase of \$3,000 a year. It does not extend the \$1,000 tax credit that many young families use. The majority's budget would cut that credit in half. It doesn't extend the State sales tax deductibility fairness. The majority's budget, Mr. Speaker, even manages to resurrect the death tax. It doesn't fix the alternative minimum tax for middle-class families. It does not protect those who pay the lowest tax rate either. It would again impose taxes on six million lower income Americans who now pay no taxes thanks to the 2001 tax relief law passed by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in order to boost our economy to incentivize growth, increase investment in the United States and create jobs, Congress should not be raising taxes by the largest amount in history. This critically important tax relief should not be repealed or allowed to expire to pay for the majority's spending plan. It should be made permanent.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will insert into the RECORD letters from The Hamilton Project and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, which state clearly and unequivocally that the Democratic budget resolution does not raise taxes.

THE HAMILTON PROJECT,

Washington, DC, March 7, 2008.

Congressman JOHN SPRATT,

Longworth Bldg.,

Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SPRATT: Per your request, I have analyzed the House Budget Committee's budget resolution. The budget would not raise taxes. The revenue levels in the budget are, in net total, the same as the baseline revenue levels projected by the Congressional Budget Office. These revenue levels are consistent with continuing current law, not with changes to the law that would raise or lower taxes.

The purpose of a budget baseline is to establish a neutral starting point to debate and evaluate alternative priorities for spending, taxes, and the debt. The budget resolution adopts the baseline recommended by several respected, non-partisan groups including the Concord Coalition, the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and the Committee for Economic Development.

But the choice of a baseline does not commit policymakers to any specific tax or spending policy. Instead a baseline, in conjunction with the restoration of the pay-as-you-go rules, would provide a framework for making tradeoffs between different priorities. Indeed, your budget indicates that one of your priorities is making up-front cuts in taxes for alternative minimum tax relief that would ultimately be paid for without increasing the budget deficit.

The founding strategy paper of The Hamilton Project states that one of the greatest economic risks our nation faces today is our country's large fiscal imbalance. The papers

notes that "the decisions necessary to restore fiscal balance might be easier to enact and to enforce if policymakers reinstated credible budget rules governing both spending and taxes." The pay-as-you-go proposal in the budget resolution will hopefully help policymakers make the tough choices required to put America on a path to a balanced budget.

I hope this analysis is helpful and please do not hesitate if you have any follow-up questions.

Thank you,

JASON FURMAN.

CENTER ON BUDGET AND

POLICY PRIORITIES,

Washington, DC, March 7, 2008.

CLAIM THAT CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PLANS CALL FOR "LARGEST TAX INCREASE IN HISTORY" IS INACCURATE

Some are claiming that the budget plans adopted this week by the House and Senate Budget Committees—the full House and Senate are scheduled to consider their respective committee's plan next week—would constitute "the largest tax increase in history." This claim is inaccurate, just as the same claim was inaccurate with regard to the budget resolution the Congress adopted last year. Neither of the plans recommended this week by the budget committees include a tax increase. The House plan simply assumes the same level of revenues over the 2008-2013 period as projected by the Congressional Budget Office under its current policy baseline, which essentially assumes no change in current laws governing taxes. The Senate plan actually calls for a small reduction in revenues, reflecting its assumption that Alternative Minimum Tax relief will be extended for one year without any offset of the revenues that will be lost as a result of that extension and that a second stimulus bill this year may include a small tax cut.

The charge that the budget plans proposed by the House and Senate Budget Committees include a large tax increase arises not from any policy changes proposed in those plans, but instead from policies enacted in 2001 and 2003. Legislation enacted in those years put in place tax cuts proposed by President Bush but provided for those tax cuts to expire at the end of 2010, unless current law is changed. Both the House and Senate Budget Committee plans assume that current law will be amended to extend some of the expiring tax cuts (especially those affecting middle-class families) and make other changes in tax policy, but they assume (except in the case of temporary AMT relief and stimulus legislation in the Senate plan) that the cost of such changes will be offset by other changes in policy. They do not assume that total revenues will be increased above what is expected to be collected under current policies.

It should be recalled that the President's tax cuts expire in 2010 because their supporters deliberately designed them that way, in order to fit the tax cuts within the cost constraints imposed by the Congressional budget resolutions adopted in 2001 and 2003. While acknowledging that their real goal was to make the tax cuts permanent, supporters of those measures opted to "sunset" the tax cuts before the end of the ten-year budget window, partly in order to avoid recognizing the cost of permanent tax cuts. Now, a few years from the tax cuts' expiration, some of these same supporters are trying to act as though the tax cuts are already permanent and any proposal to offset the cost of extending them is a "tax increase."

To extend the tax cuts without paying for them—and to attack those who simply seek to require that any extension of the tax cuts

be paid for—further heightens the irresponsible fiscal nature of the original actions.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to point out to the gentleman that in the budget resolution it is specifically mentioned that we endorse the extension of the middle class tax cuts, including things like the marriage penalty relief, the child tax credit, and the 10 percent tax bracket. Our budget also provides paid-for relief from the alternative minimum tax.

I think the difference between the Democrats and Republicans is we believe in paying for these tax cuts so that we don't add to the debt and further burden our kids and our grandkids.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Budget Committee, (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, some folks think that President Bush's term ends on January 20, 2009. Many Americans have a big red circle or a happy face on their calendar already on that date, or perhaps on their key chains, and their watches that tick down ever so slowly, backwards toward that happy time.

But while President Bush may be gone from the White House in 314 days, this administration and its congressional enablers have done so much damage that generations of American families will be footing the bill for their fiscal recklessness, with compounded interest, long, long after President Bush retires to Texas. This administration has consistently chosen to sacrifice long-term fiscal stability on the altar of political expediency. They have offered the "free lunch" plan, the "pain-free" solution to almost every challenge that our country has encountered. And the greatest sacrifice that they have demanded at a time of national peril for most Americans is to tell them to "go shopping".

Well, this administration has now created a record \$3 trillion of additional national debt on its own during the Bush years. What would even just one of those trillions of dollars of debt have accomplished had it been expended in a more appropriate manner?

One trillion, that's millions of public school teachers; that's health care for hundreds of million children; that's university scholarships for millions of students. And in Iraq, this administration this week, every week, week after week, month after month, year after year, \$3 billion. With the cost of the war in Iraq in 2 weeks, we could pay for the entire cancer budget of the National Institutes of Health for a year. Showering tax breaks on the richest, the most privileged few, while hemorrhaging \$12 billion every month in Iraq, this administration has created more than a Federal deficit; it has created deficits, opportunity deficits, for millions of American families.

The administration's failure to address our educational needs means that

there's an opportunity deficit, that millions of young people are not able to achieve their full God-given potential because of the lack of support at both the public education level and for student financial assistance.

The failure of the Bush administration to address our health care problems means a health care deficit for millions of American families, the largest single cause of personal bankruptcy in America today, the health care crisis.

And the failure of the Bush administration to address our energy deficit, that is a deficit that every American feels at the pump when they get all their money taken out of their pocket and shifted over to some tyrant in an oil-producing area. The cost of the Bush administration's budget approach, their fiscal failure, is felt the most by those, who are least able to bear it: our students, our uninsured, our minimum wage workers, the elderly, and small business owners.

This Democratic budget attempts to bail out, to bail us all out. But it's mighty hard to keep this country afloat and keep our families afloat when the administration is still so busy drilling holes in the bottom of the boat.

I urge support for the rule and support for the Democratic budget as the best hope we have to do that in this difficult time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, ranking member of the Budget Committee, in my view, the premier economic mind in the Congress of the United States (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to decide which path we want to take in America. We are about to decide what budget is right for Americans. Well, let's think about what Americans are facing today as we consider their budget for the next 5 years. What's happening in America today?

Well, joblessness is up. The economy is in a downturn. It may be going into a recession. Prices are up. People are having a hard time to afford the cost of living. Gas prices are at an all-time high. Health care costs are at an all-time high and growing very fast. Home heating costs are very high. And it's a lot more expensive just to pay for food today because food prices are up. So the question is, as we debate the values that are underneath this budget, can the American people afford this Democratic budget?

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle are going to try to say all day today they're not raising taxes. We really aren't, believe us, trust us.

Well, my friends, numbers don't lie. And this budget is a series of numbers. And the numbers they're bringing before this House in their budget resolution requires, assumes, banks, plans on

the largest tax increase in American history.

When we looked at the 1993 budget that passed last decade, even then Senator Patrick Moynihan, a Democrat, a very, very wise man, a statesman, adored by both sides, said at that time that that was the largest tax increase in history. That tax increase was \$241 billion. Under the same logic, under the same math, under the same process that we have here today, the tax increase in this budget is \$683 billion.

But let's look at what kinds of taxes we're talking about. And this begs the question, can the American people afford this budget? This increases the marriage penalty in 2½ years. Can the American people afford that? It cuts the \$1,000 child tax credit in half. It eliminates the marriage penalty tax relief and increases marginal tax rates. It eliminates capital gains and dividends relief, and it brings back the death tax.

Let's take a look at what the numbers are. Income tax rates go up across the board to the top rate of almost 40 percent. Capital gains and dividends, which are the taxes on our pensions and our savings and our 401(k)s, go up across the board as high as 40 percent. The death tax comes back in to 55 percent. The marriage penalty comes and hits an average of \$1,400 per couple. The child tax credit goes from \$1,000 down to \$500. And the lowest tax bracket goes from 10 percent up to 15 percent.

Let me just give you some numbers of what this will mean to average Americans. Roughly 116 million taxpayers will see their taxes increase, on average, by \$1,833. An estimated 84 million women would sustain, on average, a tax increase of \$2,121. Approximately 48 million married couples would incur an average tax increase of over \$3,000. Taxes would increase by an average of \$2,323 for 43 million families with children. Some 12 million single women with children would see their taxes increase, on average, by \$1,091. For 18 million elderly individuals, taxes would increase, on average, \$2,181. And the tax bills for 27 million small business owners would rise, on average, by more than \$4,000. More than 6 million taxpayers who previously owed no taxes at all would become subject to the individual income tax as a consequence of the tax increase in this budget.

These aren't rich people. These are ordinary Americans working paycheck to paycheck trying to get by. The problem we have today is our paychecks aren't going as far as they did before because we have rising gas prices, high home heating costs, high health care costs.

So the question is, can the American people afford this budget?

I ask people watching this to send us your e-mail. Give us a call. Call your Member of Congress and tell us, is that what you want us to do?

And the more important question is, should we balance the budget? Yes.

Both Republicans and Democrats say we ought to balance the budget. Here's the difference: We believe we ought to balance the budget by controlling spending, not by raising taxes. And, unfortunately, what the Democrats choose to do is increase spending and taxes.

So their budget will show, by the Congressional Budget Office in their numbers, they will achieve balance. The way they achieve balance is they spend an extra \$280 billion over 5 years, but they increase taxes a whole lot more than that to get to a balanced budget.

What's more important about this budget for our children and grandchildren is not the economic damage that would be done by this budget with these huge tax increases for every income taxpayer, for married people, for people with children, for small businesses, for farmers, for investors. What really is troubling about this budget is not as much as what is in this budget, the largest tax increase in history. What's really almost the most troubling about this budget is doing nothing, doing nothing to save money, doing nothing to reform our entitlement programs. We just heard my friend from Texas. I'm on two committees with the gentleman. He said a \$3 trillion increase in debt over the last 5 years. This budget proposes, in just two programs, to increase the debt by \$14 trillion.

Let me go through that again. By doing nothing to rescue and save Social Security and Medicare, this budget proposes, by its own virtue, to increase the debt to those two programs by \$14 trillion.

We have an obligation to the next generation to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars. We have an obligation to the next generation to leave them with a better fiscal state.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle have chosen to walk away from that responsibility. They have chosen to have more money to spend today, to raise taxes, and to make matters worse for the next generation.

We think that's the wrong way to go. We don't think the American people at this time of economic downturn, at this time of high prices, we can afford a tax increase of all times. We don't think there ever should be a time where we increase taxes, because you know what, Mr. Speaker? Washington doesn't have a tax revenue problem; Washington has a spending problem. And our friends on the other side of the aisle are making it worse by not only increasing spending but even increasing taxes.

That's the wrong recipe for this Congress. That's the wrong message to send our children and grandchildren. And that's the dead wrong thing to do at a time of high prices and economic downturn.

I think we should vote this budget down and do so on behalf of our children and our grandchildren and the

American taxpayer so we can give a chance to our economy to actually grow. You're not going to grow an economy by giving us the largest tax increase in American history. That's for certain.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman asked the right question: What are American families facing? What are American families facing after 7 years of Bush budgets and Republican budgets? What they're facing are challenges like never before.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the real income of a typical family has fallen by almost \$1,000 since George Bush became President. The Democratic budget provides funds to keep up with rising food, housing, and heating and transportation costs.

In the area of education, the Democratic budget provides \$7.1 billion more for education and job training than the Bush budget. It increases funding for Head Start, special education, No Child Left Behind, and title I. Under George Bush, only four out of 10 children eligible for Head Start received services. The Democratic budget increases funding for Head Start so that more children will enter school ready to learn.

And, again, let me repeat, Mr. Speaker. The Hamilton Project of the Brookings Institution, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and the Concord Coalition have all sent Members of Congress letters stating emphatically that the Democratic budget does not increase taxes.

Let me say one thing the Democratic budget does do, and that is it relieves the burden of debt that has been thrust upon our kids and our grandkids. The Republicans, during these last several years, have increased the debt to historic highs, and in doing so, they have created a debt tax on our kids and our grandkids. We want to remove that tax burden from future generations.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, a member of the Budget Committee (Mr. SCOTT).

□ 1415

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule because it makes in order the Congressional Black Caucus alternative. The Congressional Black Caucus budget offers this Congress and the American people the choice between fiscal and moral responsibility and tax cuts for the wealthy. Under the stewardship of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative, the Federal budget returns to balance, as this chart show, in the fourth year and the fifth year. The President's budget is in red, in deficit, all the way through. It even returns to deficit in the fifth year.

If compared to the President's budget, we save \$564 billion better on the

bottom line. In fact, we save so much that we save \$48 billion in interest compared to the President's budget. At the same time, we provide significant funding for essential priorities, for example, education, health care, veterans, justice programs, all much better funded under the Congressional Black Caucus budget than the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard that we do this by canceling the tax cuts that got us in the fiscal mess that we are in today, except for those tax cuts that primarily affect that portion of your income under \$200,000. Now, canceling those tax cuts has been called the greatest tax increase or whatever they want to call it. Mr. Speaker, all we are doing is canceling the tax cuts that got us in the ditch. When these tax cuts first passed, we had a projected surplus of \$5.5 trillion for a 10-year budget. Those 10 years look like they are going to come in at a \$3 trillion deficit.

We haven't created jobs at the same time. We have a choice. We can have fiscal responsibility and address our important needs, or we can fund those tax cuts for the wealthy. The Congressional Black Caucus chooses fiscal responsibility and a morally supportable budget addressing our priorities. And therefore, I support the rule that makes the Congressional Black Caucus budget in order.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask Mr. MCGOVERN if he has any additional speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am the last speaker.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

On February 14, the majority decided to leave Washington to take a Presidents Day recess and allowed the Protect America Act to expire 2 days later, rendering U.S. intelligence officials unable to begin new terrorist surveillance without cumbersome bureaucratic hurdles. At the end of this week, the House and Senate plan to adjourn for a 2-week district work period. Therefore, we only have a few days left to address one very important issue, and that is taking action on permanently modernizing the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

This didn't have to happen, Mr. Speaker. In February, the Senate passed, by a bipartisan vote of 68-29, legislation updating the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, a bill that the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee said "is the right way to go, in terms of the security of the Nation."

We could have easily considered that legislation. But the majority, instead, decided to head home. And they may just do that again this week. The House should vote on the Senate measure, and we should do it now. We must always stay one step ahead of those who wish harm on Americans. Now is not the time to, in any way, tie the

hands of our intelligence community. The modernization of foreign intelligence surveillance into the 21st century is a critical national security priority.

I am pleased that several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree. On January 28, 21 members of the Blue Dog Coalition sent a letter to the Speaker in support of the Senate FISA legislation. The letter states, "The Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation contains satisfactory language addressing all these issues and we would fully support that measure should it reach the House floor without substantial change. We believe these components will ensure a strong national security apparatus that can thwart terrorism around the globe and save American lives here in our country."

Today, I will give all Members of the House an opportunity to vote on the bipartisan, long-term modernization of FISA. I call on all my colleagues, including members of the Blue Dog Coalition that signed the letter to the Speaker, to join with me in defeating the previous question so that we can immediately move to concur in the Senate amendment and send the bill to the President to be signed into law.

I will remind my colleagues that defeating the previous question will not prohibit consideration of the budget, but would merely require that we first take a vote on FISA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and in favor of a bipartisan permanent solution that helps protect American lives from international terrorism.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues that security also means the economic well-being of our citizens. And because of Republican priorities over the last 7 years, record numbers of our citizens are struggling like never before. The very rich have done very well. And the rest have not. Those are the facts.

The Democratic budget that has been put forward restores fiscal responsibility. It rejects the President's harmful cuts in programs like Medicare and Medicaid. It rejects the President's proposal to impose new fees for our veterans and our military retirees. It strengthens our economy. It invests more in innovation. It invests more in energy, renewable and clean energy. It invests more in education and in our infrastructure. It also provides tax relief to help struggling families. It accommodates the tax relief from the alternative minimum tax for more than

20 million households, as well as middle income tax cuts and other tax relief so long as they comply with the pay-as-you-go rule.

It invests more in children's health. It provides more funding for safety net programs. Record numbers of our citizens are literally falling through the cracks in our country. It invests in defense, in veterans, and in homeland security.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that for years we have been forced to accept the priorities of George Bush and his Republican colleagues who have controlled the Congress. That is now changing. For nearly 7 years, we have watched as they have accumulated huge debt, historical debt. We have watched as they have chipped away at some of the most important programs that help some of the most desperate people in our country. The American people have had enough. That is what the last election was about. They have had their chance. They have shown us their priorities. And the American people have rejected them. It is now time to create a budget that has a conscience that responds to the needs of the struggling middle class in this country. The Democratic budget that will be offered today will do that and change the course of this country.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1036, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2009, introduced by my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, Chairman SPRATT.

This Rule will allow this body to debate the economic goals and policies of this great Nation. At a time, when this country is on the verge of a recession and the housing market is at one of its worst points in history, there is little else that is as important as our Nation's fiscal security.

A quality education continues to be the best pathway to social and economic mobility in this country. As a Member and Senior Whip of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have consistently advocated for the maintenance of historically Black Colleges and Universities. This budget provides greater funding to our Nation's schools and colleges.

We must not only be economically healthy, but assist in the physical health of our citizens. This budget will properly fund SCHIP, to help one of our most vulnerable populations—children. Our President proclaims his support for securing our Nation's current and future economic success. However, it is our children that will bring forth a successful future. We need to invest in tomorrow by investing in them today. This starts with their physical well-being. Children, who cannot see the doctor when they are sick, will not be in anyone's classroom.

For African Americans, health and education concerns spill beyond budgetary issues into the criminal justice consequences. In Texas, over 87,000 African-Americans are incarcerated compared to approximately 48,000 African-Americans attending college or university.

The disparity between the percentages of our youth in prison versus the number of young people in college, particularly in the African-American community, is disturbing to say the least. Higher education continues to be

one of the main pathways to social and economic mobility, particularly in the African-American and Hispanic communities.

Under the Republican Budget the national debt continues to explode. The gross federal debt reached \$9.0 trillion at the end of 2007. The CBO projects that the debt will rise by a total of \$3.9 trillion at the end of 2008. This unprecedented rise in debt puts our President in the history books. During the seven years of the current Administration, the government has posted the highest deficits in this Nation's history. The President's 2009 Budget continues the failed policies that brought us to this point.

The amount of foreign debt has doubled since 2001, with most of this increased debt purchased by foreign lenders. Since 2001, the increases in foreign holdings of Treasury securities account for over 80 percent of the newly accumulated public debt—a trend that has more than doubled foreign holding of Treasury securities.

This high level of indebtedness to foreign investors heightens the economy's exposure to potential instability with additional burdens on our children and grandchildren.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to claim that the budget resolution being considered on the floor this week raises taxes, when in fact, the budget resolution does not raise taxes by one penny. The budget resolution accommodates tax cuts and indeed prioritizes tax cuts that would benefit middle-income families, while ensuring that the burden of paying for the tax cuts will not fall undeservedly on our future generations.

Section 501 of the budget resolution specifically calls for additional middle-income tax relief subject to the pay-as-you-go rule, including but not limited to:

- AMT relief (both immediate/temporary, and more permanent reform measures);

- Extension of "middle-class" elements of 2001 tax cuts: child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and 10 percent bracket;

- Eliminating the estate tax on all but a minute fraction of estates;

- Extension of the research and experimentation tax credit;

- Extension of the deduction for state and local taxes;

- Extension of small business expensing;
- Enactment of a tax credit for school construction bonds; and

- Tax incentives for energy efficiency and renewable energy which are accommodated in a separate deficit-neutral reserve fund.

The budget resolution honors PAYGO and the new House rules on using reconciliation in a fiscally responsible way. By abiding by the pay-as-you-go principle, we immediately begin digging our way out of the mountains of debt that have accumulated as a result of the Bush Administration's fiscal policies.

The President's budget and the Republican alternatives violate PAYGO and the fiscal responsibility that reconciliation is intended to achieve, by proposing tax cuts that are not offset.

The sunsets for the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts were part of the tax legislation which Republicans voted for and passed. The expiration of the tax cuts is their policy. The Democratic budget actually calls for the extension of many of these tax cuts, but responsibly requires that tax cut extensions, like other policies, must be fiscally sound, and not make the deficit worse.

This important piece of legislation gives us a budget that is balanced fiscally and morally.

It does not sacrifice the many programs and services that this Nation needs for a war that the President seems never to end.

Defense of our Nation is important; however, we must not support only one portion of the budget to the detriment of everything else. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1036 and the Democratic Budget for FY2009.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1036 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. "That upon adoption of this resolution, before consideration of any order of business other than one motion that the House adjourn, the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table. A motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment shall be considered as pending in the House without intervention of any point of order. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion."

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of

the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 5563.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 196, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield

Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio

DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva

Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inlee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson

Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta

NAYS—196

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent

Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering

Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sall
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry

Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markay
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal (MA)
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton

Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner

Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hooley
Linder
Oberstar
Rangel
Rush
Tancredo
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1458

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOT VOTING—11

Cannon
Gutierrez
Hooley
Oberstar
Rangel
Renzi
Rush
Tancredo
Terry
Woolsey
Young (AK)

□ 1448

Mr. PICKERING changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, and Messrs. HILL, JOHN-SON of Georgia and DELAHUNT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 195, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—223

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)

NAYS—195

McCauley (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder

GENERATIONS INVIGORATING VOL-UNTEERISM AND EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5563, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5563.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 140, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—277

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson